2	THOMAS M. BOEHM [SBN 63888] LAW OFFICE OF THOMAS M. BOEHM 2 North Santa Cruz Avenue, Suite 211 Los Gatos, CA 95030-5900						
3	TELEPHONE: FACSIMILE: EMAIL:	408.998.8899 408.998.4848 BOEHMTM@GM	ЛАIL.CO	<u>M</u>			
<ul><li>5</li><li>6</li><li>7</li></ul>	ATTORNEY FOR F BERNARD PICOT EX PARTE.EXT OF TIME.OPPO	and PAUL DAVID					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
0	SAN JOSE DIVISION						
1							
2	BERNARD PICOT and PAUL DAVID MANOS,		)	CASE NO. 5:12-CV-01939 EJD			
3	Plaintiffs,		)				
4	V.		)	CONDITIONAL OPPOSITION			
5	DEAN D. WESTON, and DOES I through 15, inclusive,			TO EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME			
7	Defendants.		, ) ) -	Hearing date: Hearing time: Dept:	Courtroom 4, 5 <sup>th</sup> Floor		
9				Judge:	Hon. Edward J. Davila		
0				Acton filed: Trial date:	March 23, 2012 None		
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7	CONDITIONAL OPPOS		WESTON, 5:1	2-CV-01939 EJD			

1	Having removed this action from the Santa Clara County Superior Court on April 18,				
2	2012, DEFENDANT, DEAN D. WESTON ["WESTON"] moved for dismissal (contending a				
3	lack of personal jurisdiction and improper venue) and, in a separate motion, for transfer the				
4	case to the Eastern District of Michigan (pursuant to 28 USC 1404). 1/ PLAINTIFFS timely				
5	filed their opposition on May 9, 2012. [Dkt 13-17.]				
6	The next day, counsel for WESTON asked for an extension of time to file a "reply."				
7	PLAINTIFFS promptly consented to extra time for filing a reply brief. Simultaneously,				
8	PLAINTIFFS also indicated willingness to "stipulate to an extension for supplemental				
9	evidentiary matters" but only if there was a mutual agreement for jurisdictional discovery. 2/				
10	WESTON rejected that condition, but then filed his ex parte application for more time to file				
11	"Reply Briefs." 3/				
12					
13	1/	All of WESTON'S pending expressly motions indicate that they are based			
14	ί	upon the evidence set out in the opening papers.			
15		Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction and Improper Venue, Dkt 9, page 2, lines 6-9:			
16 17	Г	This motion is based upon the pleadings on file in this action, the Declaration of Dean Weston in Support of Defendant's Motion to Dismiss			
18	<i>p</i>	or Lack of Personal Jurisdiction, following Memorandum of Points and Authorities, and any further briefing and/or authorities that may be presented to this Court in a Reply Brief or orally at the hearing on this			
19		notion.			
20	Ŋ	Motion to Transfer, Dkt 10, page 2, lines 5-9:			
21	F	This motion will be based upon this notice, the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declaration of Dean Weston in Support of			
22	h	Defendant's Motion to Transfer to the Eastern District of Michigan filed nerewith, all papers and pleadings filed with the Court in this action, and			
23		any additional argument of authority presented in a reply brief and/or at brail or all argument at the hearing on this matter.			
24	2/	See, Ex. "A" to Decl. Of Schwartz, Dkt 18-2, page 4.			
<ul><li>25</li><li>26</li></ul>	3/ <b>\</b> f	WESTON'S proposed order on this application limits to extension to the iling of "Reply Briefs."			
27	CONDITIONAL O	<u>PICOT v WESTON,</u> 5:12-CV-01939 EJD DPPOSITION			

1	PLAINTIFFS do not oppose the granting of an extension for counsel to file reply <u>briefs</u> .						
2	But, they remain opposed to the filing of supplemental evidence in support of the motions						
3	without jurisdictional discovery.						
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9	DATED:	May 13, 2012	/S/ THOMAS M. BOEHM				
10			THOMAS M. BOEHM				
11			Attorney for PLAINTIFFS, BERNARD PICOT and PAUL DAVID MANOS				
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27	CONDITION	PI AL OPPOSITION	COT v WESTON, 5:12-CV-01939 EJD				